MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara II*): Not at all. It is regrettable Sir, to hear from the official benches such statements at this time of the day, when the Government with quixotic haste and hurry sanctioned the reorganisation of the C. I. D. and for that sanctioned a huge amount without even consulting this House. It is indeed—

RAO SAHIB S. PARAMESVARA AIYAR (*Nominated*): Is reference to C. I. D. in order?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: It is not quite relevant, even though Mr. Krishna Pillai has used it as a reason.

MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara II*): Even in the sister State of Mysore, this practice is not followed; and the mere franking of communications without service stamps is in vogue and is working very satisfactorily. On these grounds, I think that Rs. 9,000 as expenditure in this direction is certainly a wastage of public revenue.

MR. N. ABDUR RAHIMAN SAHIB (*Nominated*): Will not a more effective control by the departmental head improve matters?

MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara II*): Certainly; but I fear it is but a pious wish.

For these reasons, I press the motion.

The motion was put to vote and lost.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The question is that a sum of Rs. 67,908 under Demand XI Stamps—be sanctioned.

The motion was put and carried, and the grant was made.

DEMAND XII—REGISTRATION.

MR. N. K. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Director of Registration*): Sir, I move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 3,17,960 under Demand XII—Registration.

Motion No. 515.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): I move:—

to reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,000 for Director by Rs. 2,400.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Is it votable?

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): Yes, Sir; because it is not stated that it is not votable in the budget.

MR. S. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil II*): On a point of order. The object is not mentioned. So, is the motion in order?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: In keeping with the practice adopted in the House, the object should have been stated.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): No Sir. The practice here is that, when token motions are moved, the object has to be stated Here I have asked for a specific cut. The object is very clear.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Mr. Asan can now proceed with the motion.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): The pay of the Director of Registration is revised by the standardisation scheme to Rs. 250 to 300; that is even if the Director is to be paid the maximum salary sanctioned under the Thommen Scheme, only Rs. 3,600 is necessary.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Now a provision of Rs. 6,000 is made for the pay of the Director and it is stated that the pay is personal. We are having too much of this personal pay. When a particular officer is appointed on a pay higher than what is provided for the same, it is the duty of the Government to state specifically the reasons that have led them to make that appointment. If it is not possible to get suitable persons for holding that office on the pay that has been sanctioned I could understand if a higher pay is given. No such ground is mentioned, and no such ground is evident either from the Budget figures or from any other available records. The present Director is one, who, I am sure, will not claim any special merit for the kind of work that he is now entrusted with.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Is not he an expert in textile?

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): Yes. The only argument in support of choosing the present Director is that another officer of the Industries Department has been recruited to the Registration Department last year or year before last and so it might be necessary to have a superior officer from the same department to control him. I think, by this appointment, the Government has caused legitimate room for complaints on the part of officers in the Registration Department itself, and I doubt whether the present Director himself will be thankful to Government.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: That does not arise.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): Sir, my point is that, when a particular act is done, there should be some object behind it. The Government must have had a particular object in doing this thing. What I wish to know is whether it is in the interest of the Industries Department or in the interest of the Registration Department or in the interest of the present Director of Registration or in the interest of others in service whose claims have been overlooked, that this appointment has been made. By this so much public money is wasted. On these grounds, I suggest that the amount of Rs. 2,400 can be reduced without detriment either to public interest or to the efficiency of the Department concerned.

RAO SAHIB S. PARAMESVARA AIYAR (*Nominated*): Should not the present officer get so much pay?

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): Now we are not concerned with the particular person. We are concerned with the expenditure of public money. If the officer's place is here and if the Government of Travancore cares to see—

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: An individual officer's interests are not before the House.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): For preserving the good name of the Travancore Government, I may also say that I believe that they will see that the officer will get all the protection from the Travancore Government.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. K. M. KURIAKOSE (*Muvattupuzha II*): Sir, I also support the motion. As Mr. Asan has told the House, it seems that the Industries Department has become the training ground for the Registration Department. In the case of the previous incident cited by Mr. Asan, if my information is correct, his original pay was reduced by Rs.100 when he was appointed in the new post as the District Registrar. The reasons advocated for that reduction, I am not aware of. But in the present case, no such reduction has taken place by the transfer of the Director of Industries from the Industries Department to the Registration Department. What necessitated the difference in treatment, I am not in a position to see.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: That point does not arise. We are now concerned with one particular subject.

MR. K. M. KURIAKOSE (*Muvattupuzha II*): I pointed it as an argument.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: A comparative estimate of officers is not before the House. We are concerned with the total amount of money.

MR. K. M. KURIAKOSE (*Muvattupuzha II*): I shall make my position clearer, Sir. I only say that the Government would be in a position to justify their action in case they reduce the pay of the present Director of Registration, because there is a precedent before the Government which was not questioned. This sort of transferring from one department to another will also be detrimental to the interests of the subordinate officers of that Department.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: In that view you are in order.

MR. K. M. KURIAKOSE (*Muvattupuzha II*): This sort of transferring has also got the effect of discouraging the subordinates in every department. So what I point out to the Government is that besides it necessitates the expenditure of an increased amount rather than the prescribed amount, it also causes heart burning in the minds of the subordinates of that department. So I strongly support the motion of Mr. Asan.

MR. K. PADMANABHAN (*Chirayinkil I*): Sir, I would like to support the motion before the House. In my view the appointment of Mr. Padmanabha Pillai as Director of Registration is one of the most unwise if not foolish acts the Government of Travancore has done in recent times.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The two words mean more or less the same thing. I do not want to fetter your view.

MR. K. PADMANABHAN (*Chirayinkil I*): Yes, but with a slight difference. I must say that it is a double-edged folly that the Government has done. Mr. Padmanabha Pillai has been presiding over the Department of Industries for a sufficiently long time. Particularly during a time when the Travancore Government are launching upon big industrial schemes, it is most unwise on the part of the Government to deprive the Industries Department of the services of an experienced Director. Certainly the Department of Industries has been made to

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

suffer on account of the transfer of Mr. Padmanabha Pillai from that Department. To that extent that Department has been affected.

The next question which we have to consider is whether he is a specialist in the new Department to which he has been transferred. I may say that the present Director has absolutely no special qualifications for being the Director of Registration. I believe Mr. Padmanabha Pillai has studied even the elements of Registration only after going to that office.

Then what about the pay of the present officer? His pay is almost double the maximum pay that is allowed for the post. Viewed from all these aspects, I must say that the selection has been done in a most irresponsible way. On these grounds, I support the motion of Mr. Asan.

MR. P. C. KURIYAN (*Kottayam I*): Sir, I rise to oppose the motion because I feel that this motion is brought under a misconception. It has been the policy of the Travancore Government to change one officer from one department to another when they considered it necessary.

MR. K. PADMANABHAN (*Chirayinkil I*): May I know whether Mr. Padmanabha Pillai was not trained in England on Textile at Government cost?

MR. P. C. KURIYAN (*Kottayam I*): I am told so. I have not got personal information. I know an instance when a Medical officer was made the Division Peishkar.

MR. POTTAYIL S. KRISHNA PANICKAR (*Shertala I*): May I know when it was?

MR. P. C. KURIYAN (*Kottayam I*): Some years ago.

MR. K. PADMANABHAN (*Chirayinkil I*): May I know whether one folly committed should be followed by another?

MR. P. C. KURIYAN (*Kottayam I*): No. Exigencies wanted the officer to be transferred to another Department.

MR. POTTAYIL S. KRISHNA PANICKAR (*Shertala I*): May I know whether the present Director may be made the Darbar Physician?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: That question does not arise.

MR. P. C. KURIYAN (*Kottayam I*): I will answer that question if the Chair would allow me. I know of similar instances. When the Director of Agriculture has become the Chief Secretary, neither the Agriculture Department nor the Secretariat suffered by it. There is also the instance when the Financial Secretary has become the Chief Secretary and then the Land Revenue Commissioner.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: At least one or two of your statements are wrong.

MR. P. C. KURIYAN (*Kottayam I*): In none of these cases the public service has suffered. In this case also Government might have had sufficient reasons.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Sir, I rise to oppose this motion. The sanctioned pay of the Director of Registration is Rs. 250 to 300. In view of that, Mr. Asan is right in saying that the amount of Rs. 6000 provided for the salary of the Director must be reduced to Rs 3,600. I can quite understand that. But I must point out that, strictly speaking, this House is not concerned with the incumbent of the office. Whoever may occupy the office, this House is concerned only with the pay of the officer.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): The person who occupies the office should be sufficiently efficient?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Such criticisms must come in by a token motion. We are not at that now. As I said, Mr. Asan is right in saying that the pay that is sanctioned for the office is Rs. 3,600 and not Rs. 6,000 and therefore this particular item in the Budget must be reduced. But I want to say that there is another aspect of the matter, which has not yet been brought to the notice of the House. That is this. Government thought it expedient to appoint to this particular office an officer who was already getting Rs.500. That may be seen from the foot-note given in the Budget book which says that the pay provided is personal. That being so, the real question is whether, in view of that, this House will sanction the amount. The question is not whether Government acted rightly in appointing the particular person to the office. That does not arise now. The question is whether the House will so act as to hurt this particular officer by cutting down his pay. There is what is called the security of Government services. This House is also concerned with maintaining it.

MR E. V. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*): Cannot the House question the propriety of the expediency experienced by Government?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): I am willing to grant that this House may question it but by appropriate means, namely by a token motion. To do it in this motion will result in the reduction of an officer's pay substantially. That is not, I dare say, what the House intends. The motion is an economy motion and not a token motion to criticise the policy of Government. If the point is that the officer should not have been removed from the Industries Department, that should be raised in the Demand for the Industries Department by a token motion. The wisdom or unwisdom of the Government action cannot be raised in this motion.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): Are we not entitled to say that this amount is unnecessarily spent?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Yes. But it is not unnecessarily spent when we consider that there is such a thing as security of service. It is on a consideration of this that the House should say that it is unnecessary to provide Rs. 6,000 for salary of the Director of Registration. The precise point to consider is whether, on considerations of the security that should be

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

guaranteed to every appointment in the Government service, this House will spend this additional Rs. 2,400 for the next year.

MR. K. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI (*Quilon I*): If the appointment of the former Industries Director as Registration Director is made, can that question not be considered under this motion?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): That also can be questioned but by a token motion. Now the only question is whether the House will be justified in sanctioning this additional sum for the reason mentioned by me.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I am concerned with this in two respects. The first is whether the motion is admissible. On that point the Law Member has not raised any objection. He raised his objection on another ground which, according to me, is an objection on the merits of the proposal.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAY (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Quite so, Sir. Here the motion is an economy motion and the question is whether the House will compel this officer to go with a smaller salary.

MR. K. M. KURIAKOSE (*Muvattupuzha II*): Is it not on account of the person that the pay has increased?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): I have explained it.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Rural*): Does not this principle arise under this motion, *viz.*, whether an officer can be appointed on a pay higher than the sanctioned pay?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): That may arise. But the House has to consider why it was so done before it comes to a judgment. That is what I am trying to point out. Government considered it expedient to appoint to this place an officer who has already Rs. 500. It is not a case of Government appointing a new man on Rs. 500. Therefore the main question is whether, in the interest of the security of service, the House will grant this amount or not. I appeal to the House to consider this aspect of the matter in coming to a judgment.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): Is it because the Government felt that Mr. Padmanabha Pillai could not be given Rs. 500 in any other place that he has been appointed as Director of Registration?

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): That is not exactly the point now. Government did appoint this person to this place. The expediency of it does not arise under this motion. Here is an economy question. The question here is whether for the reason that I suggested the House will sanction this extra amount. At any rate, that is one of the matters to be considered, namely, whether, in the interest of security of the service, this House will sanction this additional amount of Rs. 2,400.

MR. K. M. KURIAKOSE (*Muvattupuzha II*): May I know whether the Leather Expert who was getting Rs. 400 was not appointed to a place on Rs. 300?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*) I have no concern with other points. The point that I want to stress is that the real question is whether, in the interests of the security of service, the House will sanction the amount or not.

MR. E. V. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*): Sir, I support the motion. and in doing so I wish to answer the objections raised by the Law Member. The three points urged by the Law Member are firstly, that expediency of the appointment has not been questioned or should not be questioned here; secondly, the security of service will be affected by this cut; and thirdly, this being an economy motion other things are out of consideration. My submission with regard to these points is this. In regard to the argument that it is an economy motion, my submission is when various gradations of the service were made and salary fixed for every appointment in the Government service the salary of the Registration Director was fixed at 250-300, taking into consideration all aspects; and it is clearly admitted by Government that they want for the place of the Director of Registration only one carrying a salary of Rs. 300. It has not been made out by the Government why they thought that one who is drawing a higher salary should be appointed to the place. We do say in the interests of the Registration Department or any other branch of the administration, higher salaried officers are not needed. Therefore the propriety of the step adopted by Government in this instance can in my opinion be questioned by this House. In regard to security of services this House wants to knew whether that question is not left to the officers who take service under the Government. Therefore security of service does not arise at all for consideration. Even if it arises ,certainly this House wants them to know and wants the whole world to know that this Government have acted most arbitrarily in regard to the interests of the officers entertained by them. Therefore it is all the more reasonable that this House should enter its emphatic protest against the way in which Government have acted.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: The particular officer's interests are safeguarded by the Service Regulations. An officer gets the same pay unless there is some punishment meted out to him.

MR. E. V. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Pattanamtitta*): I thank the Chair for the useful suggestion. Even in that case the particular officer's interests do not suffer in this particular case.

Thirdly, it is a very wonderful proposition made by the Law Member that the expediency of services should not be questioned by this House. On the other hand, we are here to see as suggested by Mr. Kuriyan that the Darbar Physician is not appointed as Professor of English in the Arts College or Science College. We are here to see whether the various individuals appointed in certain places in the service are able to carry on the duties entrusted on them. Therefore the House will be certainly acting manly if it carries the motion and brings home to Government the arbitrary way in which they have made the appointment.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*): Sir, I support the motion. I shall be glad if the Government accept this position that every head of a department after having put in four or five years of service in one particular department is sent out as head of another department so that all the heads of departments may have an idea, an intimate knowledge of the working of all the departments in the State. If it was under that principle that the Director of Industries has been appointed or transported or deputed as Director of Registration, well, Sir, I would not have opposed the motion. But I know it was not on that principle that he has been transferred from the Industries Department to the Registration Department. As it stands now, with all respect to the present Director of Registration, I would submit to the House that he is "a square man in a round hole," because he has very little experience of the technicalities of the Registration Department.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: That point does not arise.

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*): I do not press that point. The Law Member in opposing the motion pointed out that there should be security of service. If by reducing this amount the Government think that security of service would be affected I submit that this officer could be appointed on Rs. 600 as the Director of State Guests' Department. If we succeed in reducing this amount, we can see that Mr. Padmanabha Pillai is sent out as the Director of State Guests' Department. At present the State Guests' Department is being manned by an old lady-pensioned—on an unnecessary high salary.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: That is far-fetched. That argument need not be advanced.

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*): I advance that argument only to show that there is security of service, even granting that this House succeeds in reducing this amount. With these words, I support the motion.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Rural*): Sir, I support the motion. In doing so, I wish to offer a few remarks about the way in which salaries are fixed and officers are appointed to various posts. I may be permitted to submit for the consideration of the House that there seems to be a good deal of irresponsibility in the way in which salaries of officers are fixed.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*): Does that general question of the irresponsible way in which salaries are fixed arise under this motion?

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Rural*): With specific reference to the present motion, I am saying this.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I think Mr. Thanu Pillai is in order because it may be his idea to strengthen his argument about the particular instance by referring to what he considers a general principle. Within moderate limits it may be allowed.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum—Rural*) : Exactly so. In regard to this office, the House may remember that, a little before the appointment of the present Director on Rs. 500, Government thought it necessary to reduce the pay of this office. It was originally Rs. 300-400. They deliberately reduced that pay to Rs. 250-300. And what followed that reduction? That reduction was followed by the appointment of an officer on Rs. 500. Sir, is there anything unpardonable, anything out of place, anything objectionable in my submission to the House that things are being done in an irresponsible way? That is what I ask. If the Government thought that for this place an officer on Rs. 300-400 was not necessary, that his status should only be such as to entail an expenditure of Rs. 250-300, what was there brought to the notice of Government a few months after to appoint an officer on Rs. 500? Is it not want of responsibility in the application of public funds, I ask? I expect the Government Benches to give me a definite, clear and convincing answer to that question.

Now, Sir, I certainly emphasise this point. When we fix a pay, that should be fixed with reference to the status, experience, qualification, work and other things and the capacity of the officer to be put in charge of the office. There is no meaning in saying that already the present Director was drawing Rs. 500. Government benches are bound to answer that question. I take it that the Government are not acting in the way in which they ought to have acted. Having reduced the pay of the Registration Director, what is it that they should have done? They should have appointed an officer in the sanctioned scale. In this case, the original maximum pay was Rs. 400. Government found it necessary to reduce it and at the same time they appointed an officer on Rs. 500. This certainly can by no means be allowed to go unchallenged. As for that point, the Law Member suggested that, out of consideration of security of service, we should refrain from pressing this. Are we alone concerned with security of service? Have not the Government a duty in that matter? Are they not concerned with security of service of their employees? Why should that security be granted at the expense of all the considerations of fairness, principle, and responsibility? I think they ought to grant security with reference to all these considerations. They cannot say that, if this officer is to continue on Rs. 500, he should be put in charge of an office for which the sanctioned pay is only Rs. 100 or 200. They ought to see that the officer is given security on reasonable conditions. That is all that the House is capable of accepting and agreeing to. When the Law Member referred to the security of service, I naturally expected him to mention to the House the circumstances which necessitated the transfer of our former Director of Industries as the Director of Registration. In other words, I expect the Government Benches to explain to us why this particular officer had to be appointed as Director of Registration instead of an officer on Rs. 250-300 as provided for under the Standardisation. I am sorry, Sir, that the Law Member had nothing to say on this point. It is all behind the screen. Was the present

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Director found unfit for the post of Director of Industries? What was the special reason for appointing him as the Director of Registration in spite of his high pay? Sir, we cannot certainly agree to things done in a way that could not be given publicity to. (Mr E. V. Krishna Pillai; *Hear, hear.*) This kind of action on the part of the Government, I should characterise as highly irresponsible. We take strong objection to that.

With these words, I support the motion.

RAO BAHADUR DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): Sir—

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): Louder, please. (*Laughter.*)

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: That arises only when the Chief Secretary actually begins to speak.

MR. M. SIVATANU PILLAI (*Tovala*): I saw his lips moving, Sir. (*Continued laughter.*)

RAO BAHADUR DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): I may assure my friend Mr. Sivatanu Pillai that he will hear me when I begin to speak.

Sir, the motion is to reduce the allotment for the Director of Registration by Rs. 2,400. I take it that Mr. Asan wants, by this motion, that the pay of the Director of Registration should be reduced to Rs. 300. But, Sir, there is just one point which probably Mr. Asan forgot or did not want to take note of. The pay of the Director of Registration, according to the Standardisation Scheme, is Rs. 250-300. The previous Directors of Registration were also the Registrars of Joint Stock Companies and they were getting an allowance of Rs. 100 a month. Therefore, in fairness, Mr. Asan should seek to reduce only Rs. 1,200 and not Rs. 2,400. This does not mean that I agree to the reduction of Rs. 1,200. Sir, this is only a small matter.

The points for consideration are whether, by the present arrangement, Government have incurred any additional expenditure and whether the work of the Registration Department or of the Industries Department has suffered. As regards the first point, I may say that the Government have not had to incur any additional expenditure. So far, there has been no additional expenditure taking the two Departments together. There has been, if at all, only a small saving.

Then, as regards the work of the two departments, I do not think it has suffered on account of the present arrangement.

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*): Will the work of any Department suffer if the present Director of Registration is appointed as the Director of State Guests?

RAO BAHADUR DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): That is entirely beside the point.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I have ruled out that question once before. If Mr. S. J. Nair, persists in that course, he will have to thank himself for that. Please do not put that question again.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*): I bow to your ruling Sir. (*Laughter*).

RAO BAHADUR DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): As I said, Sir, the work of the Registration Department has not suffered by the appointment of the present Director. At any rate, Government have not had so far any complaint in that respect from any quarter. Nor has the work of the Industries Department suffered in any respect.

Sir, it was observed by some Honourable Members that Mr. Padmanabha Pillai is an expert in textiles. But, in the Department of Industries, there is another expert in textiles; and I may say that he is able to do the work which Mr. Padmanabha Pillai did when he was the Textile expert.

MR A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*): Has the working of these two Departments improved by the present change?

RAO BAHADUR DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): It has not deteriorated, Sir .(*Laughter.*)

MR. K. PADMANABHAN (*Chirayinkil I*): Am I to understand Mr. N. K. Padmanabha Pillai was not doing anything when he was the Director of Industries?

RAO BAHADUR DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): He was in charge of the administration of the Department.

MR. A. EASWARA PILLAI (*Kalkulam II*): Does the Registration Department require a Textile Expert?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: That does not arise.

RAO BAHADUR DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*)) The Registration Department was in need of an officer as Director, not necessarily a textile expert; and Mr. Padmanabha Pillai was appointed as Director. He is doing the work satisfactorily. At any rate, Government have not received any complaint about his work so far; nor have they noticed any defect in the administration of the department.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum – Rural*): May I know what saving the Government could have made if they had appointed, as Director of Registration an officer an on Rs. 250-300, the pay sanctioned for the post?

RAO BAHADUR DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): It is easily calculated, Sir. I think the question presupposes that one of the District Registrars would have been promoted as the Director of Registration. I do not see why Honourable Members should take it for granted. When on the last occasion the post of the Director of Registration fell vacant, all the District Registrars were there; still none of them was promoted as Director. The predecessor of the present Director did not belong to the Registration Department.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum-Rural*): What is the meaning of fixing the pay of the post as Rs. 250 to 300?

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

RAO BAHADUR DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): That was the scale that has been fixed in the Standardisation Scheme.

MR. K. R. ELENKATH (*Kalkulam I*): May I know the reasons which weighed with the Government in making this shift?

RAO BAHADUR DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): As the Law Member said Government found it expedient to do so.

As I have already stated, Honourable Members can legitimately ask whether the Government have incurred any additional expenditure on account of this arrangement and also whether the work of these two departments has suffered in any respect. To both these questions, I say 'No.'. If the Government are incurring some additional expenditure on account of the pay of the present Director of Registration, they have made a corresponding (or perhaps even larger) saving in the Industries Department.

MR. K. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI (*Quilon I*): With regard to the Industries Department, do the Government propose to continue the present arrangement indefinitely?

RAO BAHADUR DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): No; but, whatever may be the change that Government may make in the Industries Department, it is quite possible to see that no additional expenditure is caused thereby.

MR. N. E. VARUGHESE (*Tiruvalla I*): May I know whether Mr. Padmanabha Pillai, the present Director of Registration, was responsible for the starting of the Rubber Factory?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: That does not arise.

Let me make an observation. The Chief Secretary is now speaking on the motion. Under the rules, the time that he can take is only that allowed to any other member of the House, since he is not in charge of the subject. Therefore, if too many questions are put to him, it may not be possible for him to say all that he has to say on this question. I am just making the suggestion to the House; not that I object to questions being put to the Chief Secretary.

RAO BAHADUR DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): Sir, reference was made to the qualifications of the present Director of Registration. No special qualification has been prescribed for the post. Any officer with general qualifications can be appointed as Director. In fact we find that none of the previous Directors of Registration, Mr. Mathew, Mr. Venkata Rao, Mr. Madhavan Nair, none of those officers had any special qualification for the post. All that is necessary is an officer with general education qualifications. The present Director has such qualifications and, as I said, he is carrying on the work satisfactorily. I do not think that he is, as Mr. S. J. Nair said, 'a round man in a square hole'.

MR. K. PADMANABHAN (*Chirayinkil I*): Is there any rule prohibiting the promotion of a District Registrar as Director of Registration.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

RAO BAHADUR. DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Govern-met*) : No, nor is there any rule that a District Registrar alone can be appointed as the Director of Registration. I do not see why Honourable Members take it for granted that recruitment to the post of the Director would be made only from among the District Registrars.

MR. K. PADMANABHAN (*Chirayinkil I*) : Who is the seniormost among the District Registrars, Sir.?

DEPUTY PRESIDENT : I do not think there is any necessity to put that question in the light of the Chief Secretary's statement

RAO BAHADUR DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Govern-ment*) : I do not think it is necessary for me to give that information to the member.

MR. K. PADMANABHAN (*Chirayinkil I*) : Has the senior District Registrar ever acted as Director of Registration?

RAO BAHADUR DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): He might have acted for some time.

MR. K. PADMANABHAN (*Chirayinkil I*) : May I know the period for which he was in charge?

RAO BAHADUR DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): I do not remember, Sir.

Sir, reference was made to the policy involved in the transfer of officers from one department to another. I should say, Sir, that, in some respects, it is very wholesome policy. In fact, among the officers themselves, especially among the subordinates, there is a clamour for transfer from one department to another for the improvement of their prospects. I should think that, in the interests of service, it is desirable to transfer officers from one department to another.

MR. K. M. KURIAKOSE (*Muvattpuzha II*) May I know whether the present arrangement has not affected the security of service of some of our officers ?

RAO BAHADUR DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Govern-ment*) : There is nothing to prevent the Government from transferring the District Registrars to some other Department on promotion. That is quite possible. (*Laughter*).

In conclusion, I have only to repeat that, by the present arrangement, Government have not incurred any additional expenditure, nor has the work of either of the two Departments suffered.

MR. N. K. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Director of Registration*) : I have nothing to add to what the Chief Secretary and the Law Member have stated. I oppose the motion.

MR. A. S. DAMODARAN ASAN (*Mavelikara*) : Sir, the Chief Secretary said that I should propose the reduction of only Rs. 1,200 and not Rs. 2,400 I do not think he was right in saying that. There is provision of Rs. 6,000 for the pay of the present Director of Registration. It is for the Government to come forward with a separate demand if they want to pay any allowance to the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies.

Now, we are concerned only with the provision of Rs. 6,000 specifically intended for the Director of Registration.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

The Chief Secretary also said, Sir, that the present arrangement does not involve any additional expenditure. That is because the Industries Department is now headless (*Laughter*). I do not want that Department to continue like that for ever; because that is a department on which we entertain high hopes. We must have a competant Director of Industries; that would, of course, mean high pay, and necessarily additional expenditure.

It is also stated that the work of the Registration Department has not suffered on account of the present arrangement. But, I would like to point out that the Department could be administered better if it has as its head an officer with experience of the Department. (*Hear, hear.*)

RAO BAHADUR DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): How many of the previous Directors of Registration had experience of the Department?

MR. A. S. DAMODARAM ASAN (*Mavelikara*): That only shows that the Government have been consistently pursuing this wrong policy with regard to the Registration Department. (Mr. E. V. Krishna Pillai: *Hear, hear.*)

Emphasis has been very often laid here that the Director of Registration, particularly when he holds the post of the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies, must have some knowledge of law, that he must be acquainted with the principles of law, because he has to administer the Companies Regulation as well. All that has been ignored by Government. Further I do not think that the allowance for the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies was paid to all the Directors of Registration. I think that Mr. Vydialingom Pillai, when he was the Registrar of Co-operative Societies, was holding the office of the Registrar of Joint Stock Companies so that office and allowance are not always taken on to the office of Director of Registration. Anyhow I wish to state that the Government should not think that such posts do not require any special qualification. With these words, I press the motion.

The motion was put to the vote of the House and declared carried.

RAO BAHADUR DR.N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*): I demand a poll.

A poll was accordingly taken with the following result:

AYES—29.

1	Mr. V. T. Chacko	9	Mr. K. M. Krishnan
2	,, A. S. Damodaran Asan	10	,, Pottayil S. Krishna Panickar
3	,, A. Easwara Pillai (*Kalkulam II*)	11	,, E. V. Krishna Pillai
4	,, A. Easwara Pillai (*Kottarakara*)	12	,, K. Kunjukrishna Pillai
6	,, K. R. Elenkath	13	,, K. M. Kuriakose
7	,, S. J. Nair	14	,, M. K. Madhavan Pillai
8	,, N. Kesava Panicker	15	,, K. A. Narayana Pillai

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

AYES—29 (*contd.*)

16 Mr. Pacode A. Narayana Pillai
17 ,, S. Nilakanta Pillai
18 ,, K Padmanabhan
19 ,, Edavanatt S. Padmanabha Menon
20 ,, Kainikkara M. Padmanabha Pillai
21 ,, R Raman Pillai
22 Mr. R. Sambasiva Aiyar
23 ,, R. Sivaraman Nair
24 ,, M. Sivatanu Pillai
25 ,, A. Thanu Pillai
26 ,, P K. Thomas
27 ,, N. E. Varughese
28 ,, V. K. Velappan Nair
29 ,, T. P. Velayudhan Pillai

NOES—22.

1 Mr. N. Abdur Rahiman Sahib
2 ,, T. K. Alexander
3 ,, C. V. Chandrasekharan
4 ,, R. Dhanukoti Pillai
5 ,, Antony George
6 ,, K. George
7 ,, M. Mahomed Haneef
8 ,, N. John Joseph
9 ,, K. C. Karunakaran
10 Rao Bahadur Dr. N. Kunjan Pillai
11 Mr. E. K. Kunjuraman
12 Mr. P. C. Kuriyan
13 ,, C. O. Madhavan
14 ,, K. Mahomed
15 ,, G. Nilakantan
16 ,, N. K. Padmanabha Pillai
17 Rao Sahib S. Paramesvara Iyer
18 Mr. Kayalam Paramesvaran Pillai
19 ,, R. Pitchu Aiyangar
20 ,, Rao Bahadur A. Rengaswami Aiyar
21 ,, T. C. Thommen
22 ,, John Whitely Tolson

NEUTRALS—9.

1 Mr. K. C. Abraham
2 ,, S. Chattanatha Karayalar
3 ,, T. S Jayantan Namputiri
4 ,, T. C. Joseph
5 ,, K. P. Krishna Menon
6 Mr. T Krishna Pillai
7 ,, P. C. Narayanan Bhattatiripad
8 ,, V. Ramakrishna Panickar
9 ,, S. Thiraviam Nadar

The motion was declared carried.

Motion Nos. 516 to 519.

The following motions were not moved :—

MR. A. THANU PILLAI :

516. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,000 for Director by Rs. 2,400.

MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI :

517. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,000 for Director by Re. 1.

MR. T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI :

518. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 6,000 for Director by Re. 1.

MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI :

519. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,992 for Direction by Rs. 100.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

Motion No. 520.

MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara II*): Sir, I beg to move —

"that the allotment of Rs. 22,992 for Direction be reduced by Re. 1"

The object of my motion is to urge the necessity for re-establishing the Maranallur Sub-Registrar's office. Sir, it is not out of any narrow, parochial patriotism that I have tabled this motion but to bring to the pointed attention of the Government and the honourable members of this House the irregular manner in which the order to shift the Maranallur Sub-Registrar's Office from Maranallur to Kattakada was passed. Sir, I realise that the honourable members of this House will not relish if I expatiate on the details necessitating the re-establishment of the Sub-Registrar's Office at Maranallur—

MR. S. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil II*): May I know the place to which the Maranallur Sub-Registrar's Office has been shifted?

MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara II*): To Kattakada. To make a long story short, the Maranallur Sub-Registrar's office was started as early as 1085 and it was working very satisfactorily.

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*): May I inform the member that Kattakada is a more central place than the one in which the Sub-Registrar's office was located?

MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara II*): No, it is not. Sir, years ago the inhabitants of Kattakada and its suburban regions, evidently actuated by a desire to ornament their locality with a Sub-Registrar's office, made a hue and cry for a Sub-Registrar's office there. The then Director of Registration was asked to investigate and submit a report. He has recommended that the inhabitants of Kattakada were rather illiterate and that they were prone to exhibit their ebullition of spirits in, rather, an unsafe, unruly--

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I fear the member is inviting attacks on Maranallur.

MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara II*): I am saying this from the report. Though it is not the same wording, the gist of the report is this. Anyhow the whole question of shifting the Sub-Registrar's office from Maranallur was dropped. Recently this dead and done affair was resuscitated; and in spite of the clamour made by the people and in spite of the fact that the Director of Registration was called upon to submit a report after sufficient investigation, before the report was submitted to Government by him, by some mysterious and miraculous manner an order was passed by Government to the effect, that the Maranallur Sub-Registrar's office should be shifted to Kattakada in the twinkling of an eye.

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*): May I know from the member the distance of Maranallur from Nemom?

MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara II*): I may inform the member that the *pakuthies* falling under the jurisdiction of the Maranallur Sub-Registrar's office are miles distant from Nemom.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*) : My question was about the distance of the former Maranallur Sub-Registry office from Nemom.

MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara II*) : The honourable member is under a mistaken notion, Sir. The Maranallur Sub-Registrar's office is not intended for the inhabitants of the Maranallur *pakuthi* alone.

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*) : May I know the *pakuthies* for which it was intended ?

MR. T KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara II*) : For six *pakuthies* including some of the *pakuthies* from the constituency of the honourable member himself. Sir, I do not grudge giving a Sub-Registrar's office to Kattakada ; but my only complaint is why should the people of Kattakada be favoured by robbing Maranallur of its Sub-Registrar's office. I have absolutely no objection in giving the luxury of a Sub-Registrar's office for my friend Mr. S. J. Nair.

MR. N. ABDUR RAHIMAN SAHIB (*Nominated*) : Is there not a separate Sub-Registrar's office at Nemom ?

MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara II*) Yes, there is one. I think about six or seven *pakuthies* fall within the jurisdiction of the Nemom Sub-Registrar's office. So, I submit that the procedure adopted by Government in sanctioning this shift was most irregular and was done in a most unkind and unsatisfactory manner. So I urge that the whole question must be reconsidered and a decision must be arrived at in the proper and commonly followed method of procedure of Government and not in the peremptory, irregular and eminently unjustifiable manner in which this order was issued.

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*) Sir, I oppose the motion. It has been admitted by the honourable mover with regard to the jurisdiction of the Maranallur Sub-Registrar's office that the majority of the *pakuthies* belong to Nedumangad taluk.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT : He did not say that.

Mr. S J. Nair should first hear what the other member said. He mentioned that there are some *pakuthies* which belong to Nedumangad.

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*) : I submit, Sir, for the information of the honourable members of this House that, so far as the Maranallur Sub-Registrar's office and its jurdisdiction are concerned, the major portion of the *pakuthies* belong to Nedumangad taluk.

MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara II*) : May I ask the member whether a report was called for by Government from the then Director of Registration ?

MR. S J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*) : I know, Sir, the whole history. I have heard of the report myself, but I refrain from exposing the nature of that report, the motive for that report and so forth. It was as a result of the persistent agitation that has been carried on at the instance of the people of Nedumangad taluk who came under the jurdisdiction of the Maranallur Sub-Registrar's office that the Government have shifted the location of that office to Kattakada. So far as Kattakada is concerned, I can assure this House as well as the Government and

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

the honourable mover that is the central place where the office must be located. From Kattakada, where it is located at present, the distance to all the *pakuthies* would be equal.

MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara II*): May I know whether the member is aware that there is a clamour from the people of Vellanad for a Sub-Registrar's office because formerly there was one?

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*) To my mind the question does not appear to be relevant. Sir, there is a clamour from all people for all sorts of offices.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: Why does Mr. S. J. Nair arrogate to himself powers which he does not possess? Mr. S. J. Nair is not the proper judge of the relevancy or irrevelancy of the question. The only question for him is whether he has an answer to give.

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*): The people of Vellanad must have made an agitation for a Sub-Registrar's office there. So also the people of Vidura must have made an agitation for a Sub-Registrar's office at Vidura. But, Sir, it is not possible for the Government to give Sub-Registrars' Offices in all places where the people make a demand. But that is not the case here. The people demanded that the Maranallur Office must be located—

MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara II*): Sir, a word of personal explanation. I put that question to the honourable member because I thought that the question of distance and vicinity is a relevant matter.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT: I have already said that the question is relevant. So why should the member explain?

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*): Sir, I have studied the question of the location of the Maranallur Sub Registrar's office and I can assure the honourable members of this House as well as the mover that Kattakada is *the* central place where the Maranallur Sub-Registrar's office must be located.

MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara II*) I question that statement.

MR. S. J NAIR (*Nedumangad*): Sir, there are four or five Sub-Registry offices in Neyyattinkara taluk and the distance from Maranallur to Nemom is very short. So there is no necessity for locating a Sub-Registrar's office at Maranallur in the place where it was located before Secondly, the people were suffering seriously as a result of the distant location and they petitioned the Government that it must be re-located and as a result of which the Government rightly and correctly shifted the location of the office from the place where it was located formerly to the present place which is the most convenient and most suited.

MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara II*) May I know whether the honourable member is aware that the population of Neyyattinkara is much more than that of Nedumangad?

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*): The population of Neyyattinkara is perhaps a little greater than that of Nedumangad taluk.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. S. J. Nair.]

So far as the population who are to be benefited by the Maranallur Office are concerned, I can assure the mover that the people of Nedumangad form the majority and they are for the retention of the Office at the present place in Kattakada.

MR. A. THANU PILLAI (*Trivandrum-Rural*): What does the member say about the comparative importance of Neyyattinkara and Nedumangad? Which is more important?

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*): Nedumangad is the more important taluk.

MR. PACODE A. NARAYANA PILLAI (*Vilavankod*): Is it possible to have a sort of *via media* between the two?

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*): Kattakada is the place where the Sub-Registry Officer should be located, as a sort of *via media* policy. It is enough if the Neyyattinkara people walk a furlong or so to reach Kattakada. The present Sub-Registry Office benefits the people of Veeranakavu very much. Formerly they had to go 16 miles to reach the Sub-Registry Office when it was located at Maranallur. Now, it is not so. So the present arrangement is the best one, in the interest of all—the people of Nedumangad and Neyyattinkara. It helps all; and it troubles none.

MR. N. ABDUR RAHIMAN SAHIB (*Nominated*): Sir, I rise to support the motion before the House. As has been pointed out by the mover, a Sub-Registry Office was in existence at Maranallur from the year 1080. It will be clear from a perusal of the Administration Report that the work of the Sub-Registry Office has been increasing from year to year. In the year 1109, 2,329 documents were registered. In 1110, 4,173, almost double, were registered. Looking into the nature of the documents, we find there were 1,124 mortgages in 1109 and 2,007 in 1110 and in 1109 there were 231 sales, while in 1110 the number of sale deeds was 529, regarding the value of documents registered, in 1109 it was Rs. 3,60,564 lakhs; in 1110 it was 3,97,443. By a comparison of these figures, it is evident that the work in the Sub-Registry Office has almost doubled. If Kattakada requires a Sub-Registry Office, by all means that place may be given a Sub-Registry Office. There was a Sub-Registry Office at Vellanad. It was abolished a year or two ago. The Maranallur Office was serving the people very well. There was absolutely no justification for shifting it suddenly to Kattakada.

MR. S. J. NAIR (*Nedumangad*): May I inform the member that the office located at Vellanad was not the Vellanad Sub-Registry Office but the Nedumangad Sub-Registry Office?

MR. N. ABDUR RAHIMAN SAHIB (*Nominated*): My information is that it was the Vellanad Sub-Registry Office. Kattakada is about 8 miles from Maranallur. If it had been shifted one or two miles away, it would not have mattered. But it would be very inconvenient for people living in these *pakuthies* to go and have their documents registered at Kattakada. To avoid all this inconvenience and trouble, it is only fitting and proper that the old Sub-Registry Office is restored at Maranallur.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

MR. N. K. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Director of Registration*): Sir, the object of shifting the Vellanad Sub-Registry Office to Kattakada was. as stated by the other members the decline of registration at Vellanad in the year 1110. It was then decided to have an office either at Maranallur or at Kattakada. In the year 1107, there were 3,411 documents registered at Vellanad while at Maranallur there were 3,415 documents; in 1108, 3,417 at Vellanad and at Maranallur 3,212; In 1109, 8,037 at Vellanad and 4,173 at Maranallur. The Vellanad Sub Registry Office was abolished and then the Maranallur Office was also abolished. The difficulty now is whether on account of the regular reduction in the number of documents registered in all the Sub-Registry Offices in Travancore on account of the present economic depression, we can have one more office at Maranallur. Mr. S. J. Nair suggested that it must be nearer Nedumangad than Neyyattinkara, and Mr, Krishna Pillai on behalf of Neyyattinkara said that it must be nearer Neyyattinkara .

MR. N. ABDUR RAHIMAN SAHIB (*Nominated*): Is not Maranallur a central place?

MR. N K. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Director of Registration*): It is not quite a central place. The distance between the Sub-Registry Office at Maranallur and the Additional Sub-Registry Office at Neyyattinkara is about 8 miles. From Balaramapuram to Neyyattinkarai, the distance is about 8 miles.

MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara II*): May I know whether a report was called for by Government from the Director of Registration after a local investigation as to the necessity of a Sub Registry Office at Maranallur.

MR. N. K. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Director of Registration*): Yes, Sir. The Government decided to have the office at the present place, namely, Kattakada .

MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara II*): May I know whether the decision was arrived at *after* the report was submitted?

MR. N. K. PADMANABHA PILLAI (*Director of Registration*): No Sir, No report was submitted by the Director. Government must have personally consulted the then Director. There is no written report about that.

Mr. Krishna Pillai wants to have the Maranallur Sub-Registry Office restored. I can say that Government will only be too glad to open a Sub-Registry Office which was once abolished when conditions improve. But on account of the present fall in the number of documents registered it is not possible to have an office there now. Government will enquire into it when the time comes. I hope Mr. Krishna Pillai will not press his motion.

MR. T. KRISHNA PILLAI (*Neyyattinkara II*): Sir, in spite of the rhetorical exuberance with which my honourable friend opposed the motion, I am emphatically of opinion that the order of Government was passed without looking into the real facts of the case. Yet, in view of the assurance given by the Government member that the question will be considered again, I seek the permission of the House to withdraw the motion.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly

[Mr. T. Krishna Pillai.]

The motion was, by leave, withdrawn.

Motions Nos. 521 and 522.

The following motions were not made :

MR. A. THANU PILLAI :

521. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 22,992 for Direction by Re. 1.

MR. T. P. VELAUYHAN PILLAI ;

522. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 7,900 for District Registrars by Re 1

The question that a sum of Rs. 3,17,960 minus Rs. 2,400 be granted under Demand XII—Registration was put and carried.

DEMAND XIII GENERAL ADMINISTRATION.

RAO BAHADUR DR. N. KUNJAN PILLAI (*Chief Secretary to Government*) : Sir, I move for a grant not exceeding Rs. 2,76,867 under Demand XIII—General Administration (Excluding Financial Secretariat, Account Office and Legislative Bodies).

Motions Nos. 523 and 524.

The following motions were not made :

MR. T. P. VELAYUDHAN PILLAI :

523. To reduce the allotment of Rs. 4,413 for the Secretary to the Sri Mulam Assembly by Re. 1

524 To reduce the allotment of Rs. 3,600 for Publicity Office by Re. 1.

Motion No. 525.

MR. S. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil II*) Sir, I move :—

"*To reduce the allotment of Rs. 58,144 for salaries by Re 1.*"

My object is to urge the necessity of making a substantial cut in the salaries of the officers in the State.

MR. K. KUNJUKRISHNA PILLAI (*Quilon I*) : On a point of order. The motion is to cut the salaries under Secretariat. The object stated in the motion is to discuss the cut in the salaries of the officers in the whole State. That question can come only under the total grant.

MR. KAYALAM PARAMESVARAN PILLAI (*Additional Head Sirkar Vakil*) : I endorse the views of Mr. Kunjukrishna Pillai. The demand for a cut in the salaries of officers arise under various heads and the proper place for discussing this topic is when each Demand is made, by moving a token cut. Now we have passed 12 Demands and the salaries of officers concerned have also been passed by the House. Now if this motion were to be discussed, it will question what has already been voted by the House. On this ground I think the motion is not in order.

MR. S. NILAKANTA PILLAI (*Chirayinkil II*) I do not want to discuss the policy concerning this particular department but the general policy. Moreover this is a token cut. Therefore I think I am in order.

DEPUTY PRESIDENT : I think the motion is out of order.

LIBRARY ARCHIVES Kerala Legislative Assembly